



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/972,203	10/09/2001	Timothy E. Bishop	P 283694 D1056-CIP	3568
43569	7590	11/02/2005	EXAMINER	
MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP 1909 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			MCCLENDON, SANZA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

✓

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 09/972,203	Applicant(s) BISHOP ET AL.	
Examiner Sanza L. McClendon	Art Unit 1711	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 5,21,22,24-29 and 59.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 2-4,7-20 and 30-58.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☒ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


James J. Seidleck
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1700

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 16-17, applicant still appears to be relying on unexpected results from Table 7 and Table 8 to overcome the art rejections. Applicant's claim 16, states "...said radiation-curable composition cures faster than a comparable composition, said comparable composition being identical to said radiation curable composition except that said at least three photoinitiators in said radiation-curable composition has been replaced in said comparable composition with an equal weight amount of 1-hydroxy-cyclohexyl-phenyl ketone photoinitiator." Therefore the examiner deems that the showing of unexpected results is not adequately convincing, although it can be seen from the two examples that example 3 has a faster cure, however the data does not positively prove that it is the combination of photoinitiators is the cause for the faster cure. Applicant would need to provide a comparison between two identical compositions except one will have at least three photoinitiator and the other will have an equal weight amount of 1-hydroxy-cyclohexyl-phenyl ketone photoinitiator. Since applicant's unexpected result were not persuasive and there are no other convincing arguments that it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill level to use a combination of photoinitiators as described in the rejection, the rejections applied in the last Office action still stand. Regarding claims 2-4, 20 and 30-58, the examiner deems these are still anticipated by the art rejections because the applied prior art teaches the same photoinitiators as disclosed by the disclosure, which have the properties found in the claims. Therefore the examiner deems that the prior art photoinitiators, which can be used in combination with each other as found in the teachings of the prior art, inherently have the claimed properties. Applicant has not provided any evidence the contrary and therefore the claims are deemed anticipated for the reasons found in the pending rejections--see prior office actions.